



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Advances in the ab initio description of nuclear three-cluster systems

C. Romero Redondo, S. Quaglioni, P. Navratil, G.
Hupin

August 26, 2015

21st International Conference on Few-Body Problems in
Physics
Chicago, IL, United States
May 18, 2015 through May 22, 2015

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

EPJ Web of Conferences will be set by the publisher

DOI: will be set by the publisher

© Owned by the authors, published by EDP Sciences, 2015

Advances in the *ab initio* description of nuclear three-cluster systems

Carolina Romero-Redondo^{1,a}, Sofia Quaglioni^{1,b}, Petr Navrátil^{2,c}, and Guillaume Hupin^{3,d}

¹Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, L-414, Livermore, California 94551, USA

²TRIUMF, 4004 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 2A3, Canada

³Institut de Physique Nucléaire, Université Paris-Sud, IN2P3/CNRS, F-91406 Orsay Cedex, France

Abstract. We introduce the extension of the *ab initio* no-core shell model with continuum to describe three-body cluster systems. We present results for the ground state of ${}^6\text{He}$ and show improvements with respect to the description obtained within the no-core shell model and the no-core shell model/resonating group methods.

1 Introduction

The *ab initio* no-core shell model/resonating group method (NCSM/RGM) was presented in [1, 2] as a technique that is able to describe both structure and reactions in light nuclear systems. Within this approach, the wave function is expanded in a continuum cluster basis using the resonating group method with realistic interactions and a consistent *ab initio* description of the nucleon clusters.

The method was first introduced in detail for two-body cluster bases and has been shown to work efficiently in different systems [1–4]. Later, the expansion of the method for three-cluster systems was introduced in [5, 6].

The capability of *ab initio* methods to properly describe three-body cluster states is essential for the study of nuclear systems that present such configuration. This type of systems appear, *e.g.*, in structure problems of two-nucleon halo nuclei such as ${}^6\text{He}$ and ${}^{11}\text{Li}$, resonant systems such as ${}^5\text{H}$ or transfer reactions with three fragments in their final states such as ${}^3\text{H}({}^3\text{H}, 2n){}^4\text{He}$ or ${}^3\text{He}({}^3\text{He}, 2p){}^4\text{He}$.

Despite the success of the NCSM/RGM in describing the long range behavior of the wave functions, it has been shown that it has limitations when it comes to accurately account for short range correlations, which is necessary to achieve a complete description of the system. This is due to fact that to account for such correlations, several excited states of the nuclear clusters must be included in the basis, resulting in an increase of the problem size that goes beyond current computational capabilities. This limitation has been overcome by introducing the *ab initio* no-core shell model with continuum (NCSMC). With this method, the wave function is written as a superposition of both continuum NCSM/RGM cluster states and discrete eigenstates of the compound system obtained with

^ae-mail: romeroredond1@llnl.gov

^be-mail: quaglioni1@llnl.gov

^ce-mail: navratil@triumf.ca

^de-mail: hupin@ipnorsay.in2p3.fr

Table 1. Energy (in MeV) for the ${}^6\text{He}$ ground state using the NCSM/RGM, NCSM and NCSMC approaches at $N_{\text{max}}=12$. For the NCSM we also show the extrapolated value to $N_{\text{max}} \rightarrow \infty$.

N_{max}	NCSM/RGM	NCSM	NCSMC
8	-28.62	-28.95	-29.69
10	-28.72	-29.45	-29.86
12	-28.70	-29.66	-29.86
Extrapolation	—	-29.84(4)	—

the no-core shell model (NCSM). The latter eigenstates compensate for the missing cluster excitations improving the description of short range correlations.

The NCSMC was first introduced in [7, 8] for binary systems. Its expansion to three-cluster systems was recently achieved and we show here the first results for the ${}^6\text{He}$ ground state (g.s).

2 Formalism

In the NCSMC, the ansatz for the three-cluster many-body wave function is given by

$$|\Psi^{J^\pi T}\rangle = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda} |A\lambda J^\pi T\rangle + \sum_{\nu} \iint dx dy x^2 y^2 G_{\nu}^{J^\pi T}(x, y) \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\nu} |\Phi_{\nu xy}^{J^\pi T}\rangle,$$

where c_{λ} and $G_{\nu}^{J^\pi T}(x, y)$ are, respectively, discrete and continuous variational amplitudes, $|A\lambda J^\pi T\rangle$ are the NCSM eigenstates labeled by the set of quantum number λ , $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\nu}$ is an appropriate intercluster antisymmetrizer introduced to exactly preserve the Pauli exclusion principle, and

$$|\Phi_{\nu xy}^{J^\pi T}\rangle = \left[\left(|A - a_{23} \alpha_1 I_1^{\pi_1} T_1\rangle \left(|a_2 \alpha_2 I_2^{\pi_2} T_2\rangle |a_3 \alpha_3 I_3^{\pi_3} T_3\rangle \right)^{(s_{23} T_{23})} \right)^{(ST)} \left(Y_{\ell_x}(\hat{\eta}_{23}) Y_{\ell_y}(\hat{\eta}_{1,23}) \right)^{(L)} \right]^{(J^\pi T)} \times \frac{\delta(x - \eta_{23})}{x\eta_{23}} \frac{\delta(y - \eta_{1,23})}{y\eta_{1,23}}, \quad (1)$$

are three-body cluster channels of total angular momentum J , parity π and isospin T where ν represents a set of quantum numbers that describes the channel within the cluster basis. Here, $|A - a_{23} \alpha_1 I_1^{\pi_1} T_1\rangle$, $|a_2 \alpha_2 I_2^{\pi_2} T_2\rangle$ and $|a_3 \alpha_3 I_3^{\pi_3} T_3\rangle$ denote the microscopic (antisymmetric) wave functions of the three nuclear fragments calculated within the NCSM. The Jacobi coordinates describing the relative positions of the clusters are denoted by η_{23} and $\eta_{1,23}$.

We calculate the unknowns of the NCSMC wave function [c_{λ} and $G_{\nu}^{J^\pi T}(x, y)$] by solving the orthogonalized coupled equations obtained by projecting the Schrödinger equation on the model space spanned by NCSM eigenstates and the NCSM/RGM basis. Those equations are solved by means of the microscopic R-matrix method in a Lagrange mesh [9]. Details on the procedure will be available in [10].

3 Application to ${}^6\text{He}$

The lightest Borromean nucleus is ${}^6\text{He}$ [11, 12], formed by an ${}^4\text{He}$ core and two halo neutrons. It is, therefore, an ideal first candidate to be studied within a three-body formalism. Hence, it was used as a test case when the NCSM/RGM formalism for three-cluster dynamics was introduced in [5, 6] and here is studied again in order to perform a benchmark with such results. In this first calculation, we




Figure 1. Most relevant hyperradial contributions to the ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s. wave function. Both the contribution from the NCSM wave function and the total NCSMC wave function are shown for a $N_{\text{max}} = 6$ model space. The figure shows how the addition of the three-cluster basis within the NCSMC compensates the limitations of the NCSM to obtain an extended wave function characteristic of two-neutron halo nuclei. The hyperradial wave functions $u_{Kv}(\rho)$ are the coefficients of the wave function when expanded in the hyperspherical basis, where K represents the hypermomentum.

describe the ${}^4\text{He}$ core only by its g.s. wave function and couple the three-cluster basis with the ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s. eigenstate obtained through the NCSM.

We used the same potential used in [5, 6], i.e., the similarity-renormalization-group (SRG) [13, 14] evolved potential obtained from the chiral N^3LO NN interaction [15] with $\Lambda_{\text{SRG}} = 1.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. With this soft potential the binding energy can be accurately computed by extrapolating the NCSM results to $N_{\text{max}} \rightarrow \infty$, hence providing a good benchmark for the newly implemented NCSMC.

From Table 1, we can see that the NCSMC g.s. energy quickly converges to the NCSM extrapolated value, unlike in the NCSM/RGM. This is due to the fact that the ${}^6\text{He}$ NCSM eigenstate takes into account the short range correlations and ${}^4\text{He}$ core polarization that are missing when considering the cluster basis alone. It is also important to note that, in contrast to the behavior offered by the NCSM, the NCSMC recovers the correct extended asymptotic behavior of the wave function. In Fig 1 such comparison is shown in a preliminary calculation in an $N_{\text{max}} = 6$ model space.

Finally, we can also compare the probability densities from the ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s. obtained with the NCSM/RGM and the NCSMC. In Fig. 2, such comparison is shown and it is interesting to find that while the two main configurations (di-neutron and cigar) appear to have the same probability within the NCSM/RGM, the di-neutron probability is enhanced when using the NCSMC. This asymmetry in the strength of the probability peaks is known to be a characteristic of ${}^6\text{He}$ and these results show that it is a consequence of the short range correlations.

4 Conclusions

The NCSMC uses an ansatz wave function that includes both an expansion in a continuum three-cluster basis and in a discrete basis of NCSM eigenstates. This provides a foundation that is capable of describing both short and long range characteristics of three-cluster systems. In the case of the ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s., we could see that this approach provides both the correct binding energy and extended asymptotic behavior unlike the NCSM that does provide the correct binding energy, but not the correct




Figure 2. Probability distribution of the ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s. wave function in terms of the relative distance between the neutrons (r_{nn}) and the distance between the center of mass of the neutrons and the ${}^4\text{He}$ ($r_{\alpha,nn}$). The di-neutron and cigar configurations appear to have the same probability within the NCSM/RGM (a), while the di-neutron probability is enhanced when using the NCSMC (b).

asymptotics, or the NCSM/RGM that does the opposite. Calculations in larger model spaces for both g.s. and continuum states of ${}^6\text{He}$ are underway.

Acknowledgements

Prepared in part by LLNL under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, under Work Proposal Number SCW1158. Support from the NSERC Grant No. 401945-2011 is acknowledged. TRIUMF receives funding via a contribution through the Canadian National Research Council.

References

- [1] S. Quaglioni, P. Navrátil, Physical Review Letters **101**, 092501 (2008)
- [2] S. Quaglioni, P. Navrátil, Physical Review C **79**, 044606 (2009)
- [3] P. Navrátil, S. Quaglioni, Physical Review C **83**, 044609 (2011)
- [4] P. Navrátil, S. Quaglioni, Physical Review Letters **108**, 042503 (2012)
- [5] S. Quaglioni, C. Romero-Redondo, P. Navrátil, Phys.Rev. **C88**, 034320 (2013)
- [6] C. Romero-Redondo, S. Quaglioni, P. Navrátil, G. Hupin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 032503 (2014)
- [7] S. Baroni, P. Navrátil, S. Quaglioni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 022505 (2013)
- [8] S. Baroni, P. Navrátil, S. Quaglioni, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 034326 (2013)
- [9] M. Hesse, J.M. Sparenberg, F.V. Raemdonck, D. Baye, Nucl. Phys. **A640**, 37 (1998)
- [10] C. Romero-Redondo, S. Quaglioni, P. Navrátil, G. Hupin, In preparation (2015)
- [11] I. Tanihata, J. Phys. **G22**, 157 (1996)
- [12] I. Tanihata, H. Hamagaki, O. Hashimoto, Y. Shida, N. Yoshikawa, K. Sugimoto, O. Yamakawa, T. Kobayashi, N. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2676 (1985)
- [13] S.K. Bogner, R.J. Furnstahl, R.J. Perry, Phys. Rev. C **75**, 061001 (2007)
- [14] R. Roth, S. Reinhardt, H. Hergert, Phys. Rev. C **77**, 064003 (2008)
- [15] D.R. Entem, R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 041001 (2003)